



Materials for Tuesday Meeting

Kelly Shenk to: Glenn.Carpenter, Lisa.Duriancik

Cc: Richard Batiuk, gshenk

5 AM

Hi Glenn and Lisa,

I was planning on bringing the following 2 handouts to the meeting.

Also, let me know who you'd like to do welcome and opening remarks. Would you like both USDA and EPA to give opening remarks? Rich Batiuk can do it for EPA.

1. Expanded agenda which lists actions we are looking for under each agenda item. I based this on Glenn's latest version of the agenda. The only change I made was to the SWAT item based on discussions with Gary.

2. Summary of action items from April meeting (USGS asked us to amend the list to include a more detailed action item regarding SPARROW).

Kelly Shenk
Agricultural Policy Coordinator
U.S. EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
410 Severn Avenue, Suite 112
Annapolis, Maryland 21403
phone: 410-267-5728
fax: 410-267-5777

USDA/EPA/USGS Modeling Coordination Meeting
U.S. EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room
410 Severn Avenue, Annapolis City Marina, Annapolis
(Separate building near the waterfront-enter through doors facing the parking lot)

Tuesday, July 27, 2010

9:00 AM – 4:00 PM

9:00 AM

Welcome and Introductions

9:10 AM

CEAP Cropland Chesapeake Bay Assessment – Summary of Preliminary Findings

- Overview of methodology for CEAP Cropland in the Bay
- Summary of major findings
- Review of and discussion of scenarios (“no practice”, “background”, “all possible practices in place”, baseline conservation)

ACTION: Develop good understanding of methodology and preliminary results from CEAP Chesapeake Study.

10:30 AM

Comparative Analysis of CEAP Cropland Findings with Chesapeake Bay Watershed

Model Results

- How does CEAP inventory of conservation implementation compare to state-reported conservation implementation data used in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model?
- How do CEAP findings on practice effectiveness compare to BMP effectiveness estimates used in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model? o Nutrient management practice and manure management as case examples
- How do CEAP predictions of agricultural loads compare to agricultural loads predicted with the Chesapeake Bay Watershed and SPARROW Models?
- Are there opportunities for refining Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model based on CEAP study.

ACTION: Conduct preliminary comparative analysis (on the fly!) between CEAP findings, Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model output, and SPARROW analysis.

ACTION: Identify any near-term revisions to make to Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model this summer/fall based on CEAP analysis.

ACTION: Identify next steps for continued comparative analysis. Identify key leads and schedule.

12:00 PM

Lunch Break *You may bring your own lunch or pick up from a local restaurant.*

1:00 PM

Messaging and Management Strategies

- Are there any differences in findings between the CEAP study and the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model? If so, what are the differences and how can they be explained?
- Are overall CEAP recommendations consistent with direction that Chesapeake Bay Program is taking to further reduce nutrient and sediment loads from agriculture? (State approaches in Watershed Implementation Plans, NRCS & CBP focus on priority watersheds and priority practices, promoting more advanced practices for addressing nutrient imbalances in the watershed, etc.).
- Will there be upcoming SPARROW results and what will those messages be?
- Plans for Report Roll-out (schedule for finalizing report, public review, and publishing report).

ACTION: Identify next steps to compare CEAP and CBP messages and explain any differences in messages and management directions. Identify key leads and schedule.

ACTION: Determine schedule for finalizing report, internal review, public review, report release. Identify EPA role in report review.

2:00 PM

Modeling Collaboration Opportunities

- Develop a plan for exploring the opportunity to incorporate the SWAT model into Phase 5.3 Watershed Model. As an initial case study evaluate this possibility using the Choptank Watershed as a case study. Compare Phase 5.3 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model with CEAP SWAT model and SPARROW, with a focus on well-characterized subwatersheds.

ACTION: Develop next steps for exploring incorporation of the SWAT model into Phase 5.3 Watershed Model. Identify key leads, next steps, and schedule.

3:30 PM

Meeting Wrap-up: Next Steps, Future Collaboration, Adjourn

Upcoming meetings to:

- Expand Chesapeake Bay Watershed Monitoring Network using lessons learned on monitoring designs and land treatment from CEAP watershed studies (separate meeting).
Note: this discussion could inform monitoring efforts planned in the “Showcase Watersheds.”
- Further discuss data sharing including inquiries on NASS CEAP Survey Data or others arising out of this meeting.
- Develop CBP/EPA input into the “CEAP Roadmap” (separate meeting)
- Present CEAP overview and results in the Bay to CBP & States (suggested in last meeting)

ACTION: Set up process, key leads, and schedule for following up on these other action items.

4:00 PM

Adjourn

Revised July 22, 2010

**USDA/EPA Chesapeake Bay Models Meeting
Annapolis, Maryland
Friday, April 9, 2010**

- of Chesapeake Bay
the partnership's
the efficiencies of
- ke Bay watershed
up and the potential to
- BPO for comparison
- arison with the CBP
- eapeake Bay watershed
- eake Bay watershed with
- EPA CBPO
- nto the Phase 5.3
i modules.
- ted Watershed
Watershed
; September.]
- riority watersheds.
- NRCS priority
alts).
- ring in comparison with
sin.
- orts build into NRCS's
- set up opportunities to use more observations on monitoring design and station siting from
CEAP watershed studies; work with USGS and other key partners to translate into continued
expansion of the Chesapeake Bay watershed monitoring network and USDA Showcase
Watershed monitoring strategies.